

EXHIBIT A

**KOHN, SWIFT & GRAF, P.C.**

Since its founding in 1969, the firm of Kohn, Swift & Graf, P.C., has been a national leader in the prosecution of antitrust class actions and other complex commercial litigation. Kohn, Swift & Graf, P.C. and its attorneys have been selected by courts and co-counsel to be lead counsel, or members of the executive committee of counsel, in scores of class actions throughout the country in the antitrust, securities fraud, tort and consumer protection fields.

The firm has been co-lead counsel in the *Holocaust Era* cases and other ground breaking international human rights litigation which have resulted in settlements totaling billions of dollars for plaintiff classes from Swiss banks and German and Austrian industries. The firm also maintains a general business litigation practice representing plaintiffs and defendants, including Fortune 500 and other publicly traded corporations, in state and federal courts.

The firm and its shareholders have been recognized for their excellence in antitrust, business and human rights litigation by numerous publications, including the *Best Lawyers in America*, *Chambers USA America's Leading Business Lawyers* and *Pennsylvania Super Lawyers*.

The Kohn firm has been a leader in the prosecution of antitrust class actions for the past 40 years. The firm has been appointed one of the lead counsel in *In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation*,<sup>2</sup> Master File No. 12-md-02311 and MDL No. 2311 (MDL No. 2311 includes, among others, *In re Wire Harness Antitrust Litigation*; *In re Instrument Panel Cluster Antitrust Litigation*; *In re Heater Control Panel Antitrust Litigation*; *In re Occupant Safety Systems Antitrust Litigation*; *In re Bearings Antitrust Litigation*; *In re Windshield Wiper Systems Antitrust Litigation*; *In re Windshield Washer Systems Antitrust Litigation*; *In re Starters Antitrust Litigation*; and *In re Fuel Senders Antitrust Litigation*). The firm has also served as lead or co-

lead counsel in the following antitrust class actions, among others: *In re Ductile Iron Pipe Fittings* (“DIPF”) *Indirect Purchaser Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 12:169 (D.N.J.); *In re Packaged Ice Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 08-MD-01952 and MDL No. 1942 (E.D. Mich.) (\$26.75 million in settlements); *In re Fasteners Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 1912 (E.D. Pa.); *In re Graphite Electrodes Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 1244 (E.D. Pa.) (over \$133 million in settlements obtained for the class); *In re Automotive Refinishing Paint Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 1426 (E.D. Pa.) (settlements totaling \$105.75 million); *In re Plastics Additives Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 1684 (E.D. Pa.) (settlements of \$46 million); *In re Residential Doors Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1039 (E.D. Pa.) (\$18 million in settlements); *In re Chlorine and Caustic Soda Antitrust Litigation*, 116 F.R.D. 622 (E.D. Pa. 1987) (settled on eve of trial for \$51 million); *Cumberland Farms, Inc. v. Browning Ferris Indus., Inc.*, 120 F.R.D. 642 (E.D. Pa. 1988) (class action alleging price fixing in waste hauling industry-case settled shortly before trial for \$50 million); *In re Compact Disc Minimum Advertised Price Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 1361 (D. Me.) (settlements totaling \$143 million approved); *In re Stock Exchanges Options Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 1283 (S.D.N.Y.) (settlements reached with over 40 defendants for \$44 million); *In re Pillar Point Partners Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 1202 (D. Arizona) (settlements of \$50 million); *In re Amino Acid Lysine Antitrust Litigation*, 918 F.Supp. 1190 (N.D. Ill. 1996) (settlements in excess of \$50 million); *In re Toys “R” Us, Inc., Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1211 (E.D.N.Y.) (\$55 million settlement value); *In re Plywood Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 159 (D. La.) (tried to verdict for plaintiffs; affirmed by Fifth Circuit; total settlements of approximately \$173 million).

In addition, the Kohn firm is and has been a member of a steering committee or executive committee of counsel in dozens of antitrust class actions, including: *In re Currency Conversion*

*Fee Antitrust Litigation*, (S.D.N.Y.); *In re Carbon Fiber Antitrust Litigation* (C.D. Cal.); *In re Linerboard Antitrust Litigation* (E.D.Pa.); *In re Relafen Antitrust Litigation* (D.Mass.); *In re Brand Name Prescription Drugs Antitrust Litigation* (N.D. Ill.); *In re Commercial Explosives Antitrust Litigation* (D. Utah); *In re Catfish Antitrust Litigation* (N.D. Miss.); *In re Commercial Paper Antitrust Litigation* (M.D.Fla.); *In re Glassine and Greasproof Paper Antitrust Litigation* (E.D. Pa.); *In re Corrugated Container Antitrust Litigation*, (S.D. Tex.); *In re Sugar Industry Antitrust Litigation* (E.D. Pa.).

The Kohn firm also maintains a business litigation practice and has represented private clients as plaintiffs in antitrust cases where it was the sole counsel, or assisted by a few co-counsel. These cases were hard fought and several have proceeded through trial and appeals: *Alvord-Polk, Inc. v. F. Schumacher & Co.*, 37 F.3d 996 (3d Cir. 1994), *cert. denied*, 514 U.S. 1063 (1995) (summary judgment in favor of defendants reversed by Third Circuit; certiorari denied by the Supreme Court; case tried to conclusion before a jury and settled after trial); *Gulfstream III Associates, Inc. v. Gulfstream Aerospace Corp.*, 995 F.2d 425 (3d Cir. 1993) (jury verdict in favor of plaintiff; case settled); *Big Apple BMW, Inc. v. BMW of North America, Inc.*, 974 F.2d 1358 (3d Cir. 1992), *cert. denied*, 507 U.S. 912 (1993) (summary judgment in favor of defendant reversed by Third Circuit; case settled prior to trial).

In addition to its antitrust practice, the Kohn firm has been retained by institutional investors, including several multi-billion dollar pension funds, to monitor their investments and to commence litigation when appropriate. The firm has brought litigation on behalf of the Retirement System of the City of Philadelphia, the Police and Fire Retirement System of the City of Detroit and the General Retirement System of the City of Detroit. The Kohn firm has been lead or co-lead counsel in the following securities class actions among others: *In re KLA-*

*Tencor Corp. Securities Litigation*, Master File No. 06-cv-04065-MJJ (N.D. Cal) (\$65 million settlement approved); *In re Marvell Technology Group, Ltd. Securities Litigation*, Master File No. 06-06286-RMW (N.D. Cal.) (\$72 million settlement approved); *In re Calpine Corporation Securities Litigation*, Master File No. C-02-1200 (N.D. Cal) (settled on an individual basis after trial preparation nearly complete); *In re Schulman Partnerships Securities Litigation*, MDL 753-AAH (C.D. Ca.); *Goldenberg, et al. v. Marriott PLP Corp., et al.*, No. PJM 95-3461 (D. Md.); *In re Intelligent Electronics, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Master File No. 92-CV-1905 (E.D. Pa.); *WEBBCO v. Tele-Communications, Inc., et al.*, No. 94-WM-2254 (D. Colo.); *The Carter Revocable Trust v. Tele-Communications, Inc., et al.*, No. 94-WM-2253 (D. Colo.); *Rabin v. Concord Assets Group, Inc., et al.*, 89 Civ. 6130 (LBS) (S.D.N.Y.); *Sadler v. Stonehenge Capital Corp., et al.*, 89 Civ. 6512 (KC); *Ramos, et al. v. Patrician Equities Corp., et al.*, 89 Civ. 5370 (TPG) (S.D.N.Y.); *In re Advacare Securities Litigation*, (E.D. Pa. 1993); *Solo, et al. v. Duval County Housing Finance Authority, et al.*, No. 94-1952-CA (Duval Cty. Fla.); *In re Clinton Oil Securities Litigation*, (D. Kan. 1982).

The firm also has litigated numerous consumer and mass tort class actions, such as: *In re Synthroid Marketing Litigation*, MDL No. 1182 (N.D. Ill.); *In re Temporomandibular Joint (TMJ) Implants Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1001 (D. Minn.); *In re Bolar Pharmaceutical Co., Inc. Generic Drug Consumer Litigation*, MDL No. 849 (E.D.Pa.); *In re General Motors Corporation Pickup Truck Fuel Tank Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 961 and Master File No. 92-6450 (E.D.Pa.); *In re Factor VIII or Factor IX Concentrate Blood Products Litigation*, Civil Action No. 93-5969 and MDL No. 986 (N.D.Ill.); *In re Copley Pharmaceutical, Inc., "Albuterol" Products Liability Litigation*, MDL Docket No. 94-140-1013 (D. Wyo.).

Courts throughout the country have praised the firm's ability to handle complex class litigation:

In *In re Amino Acid Lysine Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 1083 (N.D. Ill.), and 918 F. Supp. 1190 (N.D. Ill. 1996), Judge Shadur, after scrutinizing Kohn Swift's credentials with care, stated that "[a]lthough a small firm by today's mega firm standards, it has amply demonstrated its ability to handle major litigation." At the conclusion of the case Judge Shadur praised the firm's "extraordinarily professional handling" of the matter, which justified the selection of the firm *ab initio*. Transcript of hearing, February 27, 1998, pp. 3 & 4.

In *In re Compact Disc Minimum Advertised Price Antitrust Litig.*, MDL Docket No. 1361 (D. Me.), Judge Hornby noted: "Uniformly [counsel] did their homework and were prepared and effective advocates. Their performance confirmed my confidence in their abilities and dedication to their client's cause." *Id.*, Decision and Order, June 13, 2003. In selecting the firm as lead counsel, Judge Hornby stated that "I have concluded that the firm Kohn, Swift & Graf has the experience, skill, resources, and expertise best able to move this matter forward, and I hereby designate that firm as lead counsel." Order of January 26, 2001, p. 2.

In *In re Automotive Refinishing Paint Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 1426 (E.D. Pa.), Judge Surrick stated: "I want to commend counsel on both sides of this litigation. I think the representation on both sides of this litigation is as good as I've ever seen in my entire professional career," transcript of hearing, August 9, 2007, pp. 18-19.

In his Opinion and Order entered December 13, 2011 at 30, approving one of the settlements in *Packaged Ice*, Judge Borman commended Kohn Swift for "[t]he excellent work that the Court feels Lead Counsel have performed in this case and the good result they have achieved for the class members."

Judge Rosen in *In re Rio Hair Naturalizer Products Liability Litig.*, MDL 1055 (E.D. Mich.) stated that “the work of [lead counsel] and the manner in which they conducted themselves exhibited the very highest level of professionalism and competence in our legal system.” 1996 WL 780512, \*18 (E.D. Mich., December 20, 1996).

In *In re Montgomery Ward Catalog Sales Litig.*, Master File No. 85-5094, MDL No. 685 (E.D. Pa), Judge Green praised “the efficient and excellent quality of the attorneys’ work.” Memorandum and Order, August 24, 1988.